

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

YAUSMENDA FREEMAN,

Case No.: 2:24-cv-02373-APG-BNW

Plaintiff

## **Order Denying Motion to Compel Ruling**

V.

[ECF No. 7]

## CARELON INSIGHTS, INC.,

## Defendant

Yausmenda Freeman has filed an *ex parte* motion to compel a ruling on her *in forma pauperis* application, and she requests that the screening of her complaint be performed by the presiding judge (me) or the Chief Judge of this district (also me). ECF No. 7. She bases this motion on “extended delays and potential due process concerns.” *Id.* at 1.

This case has not been the subject of delays, let alone extended delays. Freeman filed her motion three-and-a-half months after filing her amended complaint. ECF Nos. 7, 9. The unfortunate reality is that the litigation process is slow because this court receives thousands of cases each year with tens of thousands of motions that must be decided. When a plaintiff applies to proceed *in forma pauperis*, the litigation process is even slower because the plaintiff's complaint must be screened under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) to determine if any claim is subject to dismissal. *Lopez v. Smith*, 203 F.3d 1122, 1129 (9th Cir. 2000) (en banc) ("[S]ection 1915(e) applies to all *in forma pauperis* complaints, not just those filed by prisoners."); *accord Calhoun v. Stahl*, 254 F.3d 845 (9th Cir. 2001) (per curiam). That screening process takes significant time, and hundreds of complaints must be screened each year. Judges of this court must balance those tasks against tasks in other civil and criminal cases they are assigned to.

23

1 While I am sympathetic to frustrations from the slow pace of litigation, this is simply the  
2 reality of the process. This case will be screened in the normal course. Nothing about this case  
3 merits expedited or special treatment. So, I deny Freeman's request for me to immediately  
4 screen her complaint and rule on her *in forma pauperis* application.

5 I THEREFORE ORDER that the plaintiff's *ex parte* motion to compel ruling on her *in*  
6 *forma pauperis* application and screening of her complaint (**ECF No. 7**) is denied. The  
7 application to proceed *in forma pauperis* will be decided, and the complaint will be screened, by  
8 Magistrate Judge Weksler in the normal course.

9 DATED this day of June, 2025.

---

ANDREW P. GORDON  
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE